arXiv:1602.07437v2 [hep-ph] 4 Mar 2016

A see-saw scenario of an A_4 flavour symmetric standard model

Dinh Nguyen Dinh[1], **Nguyen Anh Ky**[1,2,3],
Phi Quang Văn[1] and **Nguyen Thi Hồng Vân**[1]

[1]*Mathematical and high energy physics group*,
Institute of physics,
Vietnam academy of science and technology,
10 Dao Tan, Ba Dinh, Hanoi, Viet Nam.

[2]*Laboratory of high energy physics and cosmology*,
Faculty of physics,
VNU university of science,
Vietnam national university,
334 Nguyen Trai, Thanh Xuan, Hanoi, Viet Nam.

[3]*Theory division, CERN*,
CH-1211, Geneva 23, Switzerland.

March 7, 2016

Abstract

A see-saw scenario for an A_4 flavour symmetric standard model is presented. The latter, compared to the standard model, has an extended field content containing the former standard model fields adopting now an additional A_4 symmetry structure (along with the standard model symmetry) and newly introduced fields, having also an A_4 symmetry structure. As before, the see-saw mechanism can be realized in several models of different types depending on different ways of neutrino mass generation corresponding to the introduction of new (heavy in general) fields with different symmetry structures. In the present paper, a general desription of all these see-saw types is made with a more detailed investigation on type-I models. As within the original see-saw mechanism, the symmetry structure of the standard model fields decides the number and the symmetry structure of the new fields. In a model considered here, the scalar sector consists of three standard-model-Higgs-like iso-doublets ($SU_L(2)$-doublets) forming an A_4 triplet. The latter is a superposition of three mass-eigen states, one of which could be identified with the recently discovered Higgs boson. A possible relation (interpretation) to the still-deliberated 750 GeV diphoton resonance at the 13 TeV

LHC collisions, announced recently by ATLAS and CMS, is also discussed. In the lepton sector, the three left-handed lepton iso-doublets form an A_4-triplet, while the three right-handed charged leptons are either A_4-singlets $(1, 1', 1'')$ in one version of the model, or components of an A_4-triplet in another version. To generate neutrino masses through the type-I see-saw mechanism it is natural to add four right-handed neutrino multiplets, including one A_4-triplet and three A_4-singlets $(1, 1', 1'')$. For an interpretation, the model is applied to deriving some physics quantities which can be compared with the experimental data. More precisely, the PMNS matrix obtained after fitting with the current experimental data is checked by being used to calculating several quantities, such as neutrinoless double beta decay effective mass $|\langle m_{ee}\rangle|$, CP violation phase δ_{CP} and Jarlskog parameter J_{CP}, which can be verified experimentally.

1 Introduction

Although the standard model (SM) [1, 2, 3, 4] has proved to be a very successful model of elementary particles and their interactions, especially after the discovery of the Brout-Englert-Higgs boson, or, shortly, the Higgs boson, by the LHC collaborations ATLAS and CMS [5, 6] (see also [7] for a review), it, however, cannot solve a number of problems in particle physics and astrophysics. One of such problems is that of neutrino masses and mixing which are an experimental fact. These problems often require an extension of the SM. Among many extended, or say, beyond standard model (BSM), models, suggested, the models based on a flavour symmetry have attracted for the last time an increasing interest. In these models, the original SM fields, including neutrinos, along with new fields which may be added, are assumed to adopt a flavour symmetry (transformation) structure.

In the SM, neutrinos are massless and not mixing, but experimental results on neutrino oscillations [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13] have shown that neutrinos are massive and mixing. A flavour neutrino, thus, is a mixture of light neutrinos ν_i (where $i = 1, 2, 3$, for a three-neutrino model) with masses, say m_i, expected so far to be smaller than 1 eV (see, e.g., [14]). The (three-neutrino) mixing matrix in the canonical form, known as Pontecorvo-Maki-Nakagawa-Sakata (PMNS) neutrino mixing matrix, and parametrized by three mixing angles, θ_{12}, θ_{23}, θ_{13}, one Dirac phase δ and, if neutrinos are Majorana particles, two more Majorana phases, α_{21} and α_{31}, can be written in the form

$$U_{PMNS} = U \times P, \tag{1}$$

where

$$P = \mathrm{diag}(e^{i\alpha_{21}/2}, e^{i\alpha_{31}/2}, 1), \tag{2}$$

and

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} c_{12}c_{13} & s_{12}c_{13} & s_{13}e^{-i\delta} \\ -c_{23}s_{12} - s_{13}s_{23}c_{12}e^{i\delta} & c_{23}c_{12} - s_{13}s_{23}s_{12}e^{i\delta} & s_{23}c_{13} \\ s_{23}s_{12} - s_{13}c_{23}c_{12}e^{i\delta} & -s_{23}c_{12} - s_{13}c_{23}s_{12}e^{i\delta} & c_{23}c_{13} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3}$$

with the notations $s_{ij} = \sin\theta_{ij}$ and $c_{ij} = \cos\theta_{ij}$, $1 \leq i < j \leq 3$, used. Here, the mixing angles and the phases are taken within the following ranges: $\theta_{ij} \in [0, \pi/2]$, $\delta \in [0, 2\pi]$, $\alpha_{j1} \in [0, 2\pi]$, $j = 2, 3$. As the Dirac phase δ is related to the CP violation (CPV) phenomenon it is also called the CPV phase and denoted as δ_{CP} (but below the short notation δ is more frequently used). The best fit values of the neutrino oscillation angles, given in [14, 15], are close to the

tri-bi-maximal (TBM) mixing, where $\sin^2\theta_{12}^{TBM} = 1/3$, $\sin^2\theta_{23}^{TBM} = 1/2$ and $\sin^2\theta_{13}^{TBM} = 0$ [16]. The most recent neutrino oscillation experimental data [14, 15], summarized in Table 1 for both the normal ordering (NO) and the inverse ordering (IO) of neutrino masses, has shown, however, a deviation of the PMNS matrix from the TBM form. There have been many attempts, including an assumption of a flavour symmetry (see more details below), to explain this phenomenon.

Parameter	Best fit	1σ range	2σ range	3σ range
$\Delta m^2_{21}/10^{-5}$ eV^2 (NO or IO)	7.54	7.32 – 7.80	7.15 – 8.00	6.99 – 8.18
$\sin^2\theta_{12}/10^{-1}$ (NO or IO)	3.08	2.91 – 3.25	2.75 – 3.42	2.59 – 3.59
$\Delta m^2_{31}/10^{-3}$ eV^2 (NO)	2.47	2.41 – 2.53	2.34 – 2.59	2.27 – 2.65
$\lvert\Delta m^2_{32}\rvert/10^{-3}$ eV^2 (IO)	2.42	2.36 – 2.48	2.29 – 2.55	2.23 – 2.61
$\sin^2\theta_{13}/10^{-2}$ (NO)	2.34	2.15 – 2.54	1.95 – 2.74	1.76 – 2.95
$\sin^2\theta_{13}/10^{-2}$ (IO)	2.40	2.18 – 2.59	1.98 – 2.79	1.78 – 2.98
$\sin^2\theta_{23}/10^{-1}$ (NO)	4.37	4.14 – 4.70	3.93 – 5.52	3.74 – 6.26
$\sin^2\theta_{23}/10^{-1}$ (IO)	4.55	4.24 – 5.94	4.00 – 6.20	3.80 – 6.41

Table 1: The best-fit values and $n\sigma$ allowed ranges of the 3-neutrino oscillation parameters for a normal neutrino mass ordering (NO) and an inverse neutrino mass ordering (IO) [14, 15].

Besides the parameters in the PMNS mixing matrix, neutrino oscillation experiments also allow us to determine the neutrino squared mass differences Δm^2_{21} and Δm^2_{31}. Although the absolute neutrino masses have not yet been known but it is believed that they are very tiny, less than 1 eV, as said above. Therefore, one needs to understand why the neutrinos, compared to the charged leptons, are so light, and find a mechanism for generation of such small masses. A very popular mechanism of this kind is called the see-saw mechanism which can generate a small neutrino mass due to an introduction of a larger scale which could be a mass of a heavy, compared to neutrinos, BSM particle. The see-saw mechanism, appearing first as type I in [17, 18, 19, 20, 21], has been originally applied to the SM (see [22, 23] for later developments and a more complete presentation) but a natural question arising here is whether this mechanism can be incorporated in a model with an additional symmetry, in particular, a flavour symmetry. This idea has attracted interest of other authors investigating different models but here, in this paper (and others following), we will elaborated it systematically for a flavour symmetric SM.

Various models with flavor symmetries have been introduced to explain the mass spectrum and the mixing matrix of the quarks and leptons. Among them, the models constructed with non-Abelian discrete flavor symmetries added are investigated quite intensively (see [24, 25, 26] for a review). Especially, the models that are not only able to give a TBM mixing as well as adjustable to fit the data of the observed neutrino oscillations but also interesting due to their simplicity, are based on the A_4 flavor symmetry [25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39]. There are many models based on other flavour symmetries but they are beyond the scope of this paper.

In the present work, a "naturally" extended version of the SM adopting an A_4 flavor symmetry is considered. In this model the three generations of the left-handed leptons are grouped in a triplet of A_4, while the three right-handed charged leptons either transform under A_4 as its 1, $1^{'}$ and $1^{''}$ singlets, or, in another version, form an A_4 triplet. The scalar sector is minimally extended with the Higgs boson acquiring an A_4 triplet structure. Light neutrino masses can be generated via the type I see-saw mechanism by introducing four right-handed neutrinos, which are one triplet and three singlets under the transformation of the A_4 group.

In Sect. 3 we present the main idea of the original see-saw mechanism applied to the SM and extend it to the case with a flavour symmetry involved. Section 4 is devoted to a more detailed investigation on a type I see-saw flavour symmetric model which is checked by calculating some physics quantities and comparing them with the current experimental data. In this section the scalar sector of the model is also investigated. One of the three scalar mass states could be the SM Higgs boson, while the other two may be related to the still-deliberated 750 GeV diphoton resonance state [40, 41] (see also [42]). Section 5 is designed for some comments and conclusion. The bibliography of the cited works may be still far from being enough to include all related works by other authors but we hope it gives a general view on the development of the topic considered here. Before going to physics details in later sections, let us first review basic elements of A_4 representations in the next section.

2 Representations of A_4 in brief

Being a group of all even permutations of four objects, A_4 has 12 elements, which can be divided into 4 conjugate classes, thus is also an order 4 group [25, 26, 28]. Geometrically, it is also called the tetrahedral group describing the orientation-preserving symmetry of a regular tetrahedron. The elements of A_4 can be generated by two basic generators S and T satisfying the relations

$$S^2 = T^3 = (ST)^3 = 1. \tag{4}$$

This group has four unitary representations, including three one-dimensional representations $1,\ 1',\ 1''$ and one three-dimensional representation generated via S and T as follows:

$$1: \quad S = 1, \quad T = 1, \tag{5a}$$

$$1^{'}: \quad S = 1, \quad T = e^{i2\pi/3} \equiv \omega, \tag{5b}$$

$$1^{''}: \quad S = 1, \quad T = e^{i4\pi/3} \equiv \omega^2, \tag{5c}$$

$$3: \quad S = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad T = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{5d}$$

Usually, applications of representations of a group require us to know the decomposition rule of a tensor product between irreducible representations into irreducible representations. This rule in the case of A_4 reads

$$1 \times 1 = 1, \tag{6a}$$

$$1^{'} \times 1^{''} = 1, \tag{6b}$$

$$1^{''} \times 1^{'} = 1, \tag{6c}$$

$$1^{'} \times 1^{'} = 1^{''}, \tag{6d}$$

$$1^{''} \times 1^{''} = 1^{'}, \tag{6e}$$

$$3 \times 3 = 1 + 1^{'} + 1^{''} + 3_1 + 3_2. \tag{6f}$$

The first five rules are trivial but the last one needs more explanation. For two triplets $3_a \sim (a_1, a_2, a_3)$ and $3_b \sim (b_1, b_2, b_3)$ the components of their tensor product (6f) are

$$1 = a_1 b_1 + a_2 b_2 + a_3 b_3, \tag{7a}$$

$$1^{'} = a_1 b_1 + \omega^2 a_2 b_2 + \omega a_3 b_3, \tag{7b}$$

$$1^{''} = a_1 b_1 + \omega a_2 b_2 + \omega^2 a_3 b_3, \tag{7c}$$

$$3_1 \sim (a_2 b_3, a_3 b_1, a_1 b_2), \tag{7d}$$

$$3_2 \sim (a_3 b_2, a_1 b_3, a_2 b_1). \tag{7e}$$

The information of the A_4 representations given above is important for construction of a Lagrangian of a model adopting an A_4 flavour symmetry. Basing on the structure of tensor products of representations of A_4 we can build different see-saw models corresponding to this flavour symmetry.

3 See-saw mechanism for an A_4-flavour symmetric standard model

Neutrinos in the standard model (SM) are massless but, as said above, experimental results [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13] have shown that they have masses though very tiny. The see-saw mechanism [22, 23] is an attempt to explain the neutrino mass smallness. Let us first recall the see-saw mechanism applied to the (original) standard model. Generally speaking, this mechanism imposes an extension on the SM by adding in different ways new (heavy in general) fields in order to generate (small effective) masses of neutrinos (due to big masses of the new fields). These ways of neutrino mass generation are called see-saw models referred below to as classical or pre-flavour symmetric see-saw models.

3.1 Pre-flavour-symmetric see-saw models

There are three types of classical see-saw models: I, II and III, corresponding to three ways of neutrino mass generation, requiring an introduction of three kinds of new fields which in general are heavy. The see-saw I generates neutrino masses with the introduction of a lepton iso-singlet (a right-handed neutrino), while the generation of neutrino masses via the see-saw II and III requires respectively a new scalar iso-triplet and a new lepton iso-triplet to be introduced. Let us look at a closer distance how they work.

Neutrinos could be of Dirac- or Majorana type. A general Lagrangian neutrino mass term, denoted below by $\mathcal{L}_{m_\nu}$, has the form

$$\mathcal{L}_{m_\nu} = -\frac{1}{2}\overline{n}_L M_\nu (n_L)^c + h.c., \tag{8}$$

where

$$n_L = \begin{pmatrix} \nu_L \\ (N_R)^c \end{pmatrix} \tag{9}$$

is a neutrino pattern, and

$$M_\nu = \begin{pmatrix} M_L & M_D \\ (M_D)^T & M_R \end{pmatrix} \tag{10}$$

is a 6×6 neutrino mass matrix (for a three-neutrino mixing scheme). If $M_L \ll M_R$, the matrix (10) can be approximately diagonalized in the block form [22, 23]

$$M_\nu = \begin{pmatrix} M_1 & 0 \\ 0 & M_2 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{11}$$

where M_1 and M_2,

$$\begin{cases} M_1 \approx M_L - (M_D)^T (M_R)^{-1} M_D, \\ M_2 \approx M_R, \end{cases} \tag{12}$$

are $3\times$ 3 complex matrices and they are the mass matrices of the light- and heavy neutrinos, respectively. The light neutrinos, which are (mostly) left-handed and can interact with ordinary SM fields, are called active neutrinos, while the heavy, and right-handed here, neutrinos, which, in many models, interact very weakly or do not interact at all with the SM fields, are referred to as sterile neutrinos. The constraint (12) means that the masses of the light neutrinos are inversely proportional to the masses of the heavy neutrinos. This is the general spirit, thus the name, of the see-saw mechanics to generate a small neutrino mass with a mass scale M_R usually taking a value very large, between 10^9 GeV and the GUT scale, around 10^{15} GeV [43], but in some see-saw- and other models, M_R can varies within a wider range, even it could take a value at few keV's or less (see, for example, [43, 44, 45, 46, 47]).

A large M_R can be generated via a newly-introduced heavy field. It can be done in different ways, corresponding to different see-saw models, depending on how a coupling of a neutrino to the Higgs field is constructed, as we still assume that neutrinos can acquire mass via interacting somehow with the Higgs field. Since a neutrino belongs to an iso-doublet **2** and the Higgs field forms another iso-doublet **2**, there are (as illustrated in Figs. 1–2 below) at least four ways of their coupling (at the tree level) due to the tensor product decomposition $\mathbf{2} \times \mathbf{2} = \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{3}$: two ways in which neutrino and Higgs are coupled at a vertex to a fermion iso-singlet or a fermion iso-(anti)triplet and two ways in which neutrino is coupled to Higgs via a scalar iso-singlet or a scalar iso-(anti)triplet (see more details below). The see-saw models constructed with neutrino-Higgs coupled to a fermion iso-singlet, a scalar iso-(anti)triplet and a fermion iso-(anti)triplet are called of type I, II and III, respectively.

The see-saw mechanism can be linked to the high-dimension effective operator approach such as Weinberg's 5-dimension one in which the neutrino (effective) mass can originate from

the Lagrangian effective term $\mathcal{L}_{\nu}^{eff}$,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\nu}^{eff} = \frac{\lambda_{\nu}}{\Lambda} \left(\overline{f}_{lL} H\right) \left(H^{\dagger} f_{lL}^{c}\right), \tag{13}$$

where Λ is a characteristic scale,

$$f_l = \begin{pmatrix} \nu_{lL} \\ l_L \end{pmatrix}, \quad l = e, \mu, \tau, \tag{14}$$

and

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} H^0 \\ H^- \end{pmatrix}. \tag{15}$$

This effective process[1], illustrated by Fig. 1, can be broken down into subprocesses such as the ones illustrated in Fig. 2, where the first diagram illustrates see-saw models of type I and III, which respectively require the introduction of new fields, say N and Σ, being respectively a fermion iso-singlet and a fermion iso-(anti)triplet, while the second diagram illustrates a see-saw model of type II, which requires the introduction of a new field Δ, being a scalar iso-(anti)triplet. Mathematically, it is possible to introduce a model with Δ replaced by a scalar iso-singlet S but physically, the latter is not relevant to describe a neutrino mass term. In these figures and all figures bellow, the letters ν and H symbolically denote the fields "neutrino" and "Higgs" (or their anti fields), respectively.



Figure 1: Neutrino effective mass.



Figure 2: See-saw models.

[1]It may have other substructures if we consider other models such as loop models, supersymmetry models, extra-dimension models, etc., which are not a subject of the present paper.

When the fields transform under an additional symmetry group, such as an A_4 one, each of these (sub)processes itself will be further broken down to sub-sub-processes according to their symmetry structure. It is the spirit of the see-saw mechanism in a new scenario with an additionally introduced symmetry.

3.2 A_4-flavour symmetric see-saw models

There are also three types of see-saw models for this case corresponding to the above-described type I, II and III see-saw models (for some versions, see, for example, [34, 36] and references therein). Now, each of the processes in Fig. 2 becomes an effective process containing other (sub)processes. Let us consider an effective process, illustrated in Fig. 3, corresponding to the type I see-saw one, where N is a fermion iso-singlet (or a set of fermion iso-singlets). This process in turn represents, accordingly to the rule (6f), a sum of four processes shown in Fig. 4, where the field N_T, N_S, $N_{S'}$ and $N_{S''}$, which all are iso-singlets, transform under A_4 as a triplet, singlets 1, $1^{'}$ and $1^{''}$, respectively. We will see this model in more details next section. The type III model (i.e., the model corresponding to the type III see-saw model) has a similar structure, where the fermion iso-singlets N's are replaced by fermion iso-triplets Σ's being also a triplet and singlets 1, $1^{'}$ and $1^{''}$ of A_4.



Figure 3: Type-I see-saw neutrino effective mass.



Figure 4: An A_4-flavour-symmetric type-I see-saw model.

The type II model is described by the effective process in Fig. 5, where Δ is a scalar iso-triplet (or a set of scalar iso-triplets). The latter process, based again on the rule (6f), is broken down to four subsprocesses shown in Fig. 6, where the scalar iso-triplets Δ's transform under A_4 as a triplet and three singlets 1, $1^{'}$ and $1^{''}$.



Figure 5: Type-II see-saw neutrino effective mass.



Figure 6: An A_4-flavour-symmetric type-II see-saw model.

As said above, in the frameworks of the present paper we concentrate on the Type I see-saw model which will be investigated in more details in the next sections.

4 A_4-flavour symmetric see-saw-I model

We present in this section an A_4-flavour symmetric extension of a type-I see-saw model. There could be different versions of this extended model but the two of them given in Tabs. 2 and 3 require a minimal and "natural" extension, thus, this model can be referred to as the minimally extended model of the type-I see-saw model, or, just, the minimal model, for short. The group transformation nature of the fields in the considered model is shown in the mentioned tables, where ℓ_{Li} and ℓ_{Ri}, $i = 1, 2, 3$, are the three generations of the left-handed- and the right-handed charged leptons, respectively, and

$$\Phi_h^T = (\phi_{h1}, \phi_{h2}, \phi_{h3}), \tag{16}$$

with

$$\phi_{hi} = \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_i^+ \\ \varphi_i^0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \tag{17}$$

is the the Higgs field with the vacuum expectation value (composed of those of the neutral components)

$$\langle \Phi_h^0 \rangle^T = \big(\langle \varphi_1^0 \rangle, \langle \varphi_2^0 \rangle, \langle \varphi_3^0 \rangle \big) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (v_1, v_2, v_3). \tag{18}$$

The structure of this vacuum expectation value (VEV) can be fixed below when the Higgs potential is considered. We note that the states ℓ_i (ℓ_{Li} and ℓ_{Ri}) in general may not coincide with the states $l = e, \mu, \tau$, to which we need to make a rotation given in the subsection following.

	ℓ_{Li}	ℓ_{Ri}	Φ_h	N_T	N_S	$N_{S'}$	$N_{S''}$
Spin	1/2	1/2	0	1/2	1/2	1/2	1/2
A_4	3	$1, 1^{'}, 1^{''}$	3	3	1	$1^{'}$	$1^{''}$
$SU(2)_L$	2	1	2	1	1	1	1

Table 2: An A_4-flavour symmetric type I see-saw model (version 1).

	ℓ_{Li}	ℓ_{Ri}	Φ_h	N_T	N_S	$N_{S'}$	$N_{S''}$
Spin	1/2	1/2	0	1/2	1/2	1/2	1/2
A_4	3	3	3	3	1	$1^{'}$	$1^{''}$
$SU(2)_L$	2	1	2	1	1	1	1

Table 3: An A_4-flavour symmetric type I see-saw model (version 2).

The field contents of the type 2- and type 3 see-saw models are summarized in Tabs. 4 and 5, respectively.

	ℓ_{Li}	ℓ_{Ri}	Φ_h	Δ_T	Δ_S	$\Delta_{S'}$	$\Delta_{S''}$
Spin	1/2	1/2	0	0	0	0	0
A_4	3	3 (or $1, 1^{'}, 1^{''}$)	3	3	1	$1^{'}$	$1^{''}$
$SU(2)_L$	2	1	2	1	1	1	1

Table 4: An A_4-flavour symmetric type II see-saw model.

	ℓ_{Li}	ℓ_{Ri}	Φ_h	Σ_T	Σ_S	$\Sigma_{S'}$	$\Sigma_{S''}$
Spin	1/2	1/2	0	1/2	1/2	1/2	1/2
A_4	3	3 (or $1, 1^{'}, 1^{''}$)	3	3	1	$1^{'}$	$1^{''}$
$SU(2)_L$	2	1	2	3	3	3	3

Table 5: An A_4-flavour symmetric type III see-saw model.

Below, we shall choose to consider the type I see-saw model (version 1) given in Tab. 2. Now, let us make a brief desciption of the scalar- and the lepton sector of the model [2].

[2]The quark sector not considered here requires a separate investigation.

4.1 Scalar sector

This sector consists of three scalar iso-doublets forming an A_4 triplet called commonly the Higgs boson. Here, we briefly discuss the Higgs potential in the model. It has the general form

$$\begin{aligned} V(\Phi) &= -\lambda_0^2 \sum_{i=1}^{3} \left(\phi_{hi}^{\dagger}\phi_{hi}\right) + \lambda_1 \sum_{i=1}^{3} \left(\phi_{hi}^{\dagger}\phi_{hi}\right)^2 + \lambda_2 \left|\phi_{h1}^{\dagger}\phi_{h1} + \omega^2\phi_{h2}^{\dagger}\phi_{h2} + \omega\phi_{h3}^{\dagger}\phi_{h3}\right|^2 \\ &+\lambda_3 \left[|\phi_{h2}^{\dagger}\phi_{h3}|^2 + |\phi_{h3}^{\dagger}\phi_{h1}|^2 + |\phi_{h1}^{\dagger}\phi_{h2}|^2\right] + \left\{\frac{1}{2}\lambda_4 \left[(\phi_{h2}^{\dagger}\phi_{h3})^2 + (\phi_{h3}^{\dagger}\phi_{h1})^2 + (\phi_{h1}^{\dagger}\phi_{h2})^2\right] + H.c.\right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

where the parameters $\lambda_0 > 0$, and, λ_1, λ_2 and λ_3 are real, while the parameter λ_4 can be complex. By choosing

$$\phi_{h1} = \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_1^+ \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(v_1 + h_1 + i\xi_1) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \phi_{h2} = \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_2^+ \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(v_2 + h_2 + i\xi_2) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \phi_{h3} = \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_3^+ \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(v_3 + h_3 + i\xi_3) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{20}$$

we get the following constraints on the Higgs VEV's:

$$\begin{cases} -2\lambda_0^2 + 2\left(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2\right) v_1^2 + \left(\lambda_3 - \lambda_2 + \lambda_4\right) v_2^2 + \left(\lambda_3 - \lambda_2 + \lambda_4^*\right) v_3^2 = 0, \\ -2\lambda_0^2 + 2\left(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2\right) v_2^2 + \left(\lambda_3 - \lambda_2 + \lambda_4^*\right) v_1^2 + \left(\lambda_3 - \lambda_2 + \lambda_4\right) v_3^2 = 0, \\ -2\lambda_0^2 + 2\left(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2\right) v_3^2 + \left(\lambda_3 - \lambda_2 + \lambda_4^*\right) v_2^2 + \left(\lambda_3 - \lambda_2 + \lambda_4\right) v_1^2 = 0. \end{cases} \tag{21}$$

The latter equation system for general coefficients (general λ_0 and λ's), is equivalent to the constraints

$$v_1^2 = v_2^2 = v_3^2 := v^2, \tag{22}$$

leading to eight different choices,

$$\pm v_1 = \pm v_2 = \pm v_3 = \pm v,$$

of the VEV's structure, where

$$v^2 = \frac{\lambda_0^2}{(\lambda_1 + \lambda_3 + \lambda_4^R)}. \tag{23}$$

Here and later the notation $\lambda_4^R = Re(\lambda_4)$ is used for the real part of λ_4. The determination of v will be discussed below.

In general, the Higgs fields defined above are flavour states but not mass-eigen states. To get their mass-eigen states one must diagonal the Higgs mass matrix appearing squared in the mass term

$$V_M(\Phi) \sim \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} h_1 & h_2 & h_3 \end{pmatrix} M_h^2 \begin{pmatrix} h_1 \\ h_2 \\ h_3 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{24}$$

where

$$M_h^2 = \begin{pmatrix} p & q & q \\ q & p & q \\ q & q & p \end{pmatrix}, \tag{25}$$

with

$$p = -\lambda_0^2 + v^2(3\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + \lambda_4^R),$$
$$q = v^2(-\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + \lambda_4^R).$$

As (25) is a real symmetric matrix, its eigenvalues, therefore, the scalar masses, are always real. It is not difficult to see that the matrix

$$U_H = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{26}$$

can rotate the (squared) mass matrix M_h^2 to the diagonal matrix

$$M_H^2 = \begin{pmatrix} m_{H1}^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & m_{H2}^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & m_{H3}^2 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{27}$$

where

$$m_{H_1}^2 = p + 2q = -\lambda_0^2 + 3v^2(\lambda_1 + \lambda_3 + \lambda_4^R) = 2\lambda_0^2, \tag{28}$$

$$m_{H_2}^2 = m_{H_3}^2 = p - q = -\lambda_0^2 + 3v^2(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) = \frac{2\lambda_1 + 3\lambda_2 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_3 + \lambda_4^R}\lambda_0^2 \equiv m_{H_{2,3}}. \tag{29}$$

are masses of the Higgs mass-eigen states H_i related to the flavour states h_i via the rotation

$$\begin{pmatrix} h_1 \\ h_2 \\ h_3 \end{pmatrix} = U_H \begin{pmatrix} H_1 \\ H_2 \\ H_3 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{30}$$

We see that there is a degeneration in two of the masses, m_{H_2} and m_{H_3}, and below the notation $m_{H_{2,3}}$,

$$m_{H_{2,3}} \equiv m_{H_2} = m_{H_3}$$

will be used. Replacing (23) in (28) and (29) we get the masses expressions in terms of parameters λ_0 or v

$$m_{H_1}^2 = 2\lambda_0^2 = 2(\lambda_1 + \lambda_3 + \lambda_4^R)v^2 \tag{31}$$

$$\begin{aligned} m_{H_{2,3}}^2 &= \frac{2\lambda_1 + 3\lambda_2 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_3 + \lambda_4^R}\lambda_0^2 \\ &= (2\lambda_1 + 3\lambda_2 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4)\, v^2. \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

From here we have

$$\begin{aligned} m_{H_{2,3}}^2 &= 3(\lambda_2 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4)v^2 + m_{H_1}^2 \\ &= 3(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)v^2 - \frac{1}{2}m_{H_1}^2 \\ &= (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)v_{SM}^2 - \frac{1}{2}m_{H_1}^2, \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

or

$$\frac{1}{3}(m_{H_1}^2 + m_{H_2}^2 + m_{H_3}^2) = 2(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)v^2. \tag{34}$$

The degeneration between the masses of H_2 and H_3 happens due to, maybe, a residual symmetry (similar to the mass degeneration of proton and neutron at the isotopic symmetry level). These masses may be splitted by some additional interaction(s) breaking further this symmetry but the split are usually small and the masses m_{H_2} and m_{H_3} are expected to be close to each other as fluctuations around a mean value.

We could consider one of the mass states H_i, $i = 1, 2, 3$, as the Higgs boson discovered recently by ATLAS and CMS. Looking at the form of m_{H_1} in (31) and because of the mass degeneration, $m_{H_2} = m_{H_3}$, of the scalars H_2 and H_3, let us identify the scalar H_1 with the Higgs boson (of mass $m_H \approx 125$ Gev [5, 6]), that is

$$m_{H_1} \equiv m_H = 125 \text{ GeV}. \tag{35}$$

Thus, using (31) we get the relation

$$(\lambda_1 + \lambda_3 + \lambda_4^R)v^2 = \lambda v_{SM}^2 \approx \frac{1}{2}(125 \text{ GeV})^2, \tag{36}$$

where v_{SM} is the VEV of the SM Higgs field, say ϕ, while λ is the coefficient of the quadruple term in the SM Higgs potential (see, for example, [4])

$$V_{SM}(\phi) = -\mu^2(\phi^\dagger\phi) + \lambda(\phi^\dagger\phi)^2, \quad \mu^2 > 0, \quad \lambda > 0, \tag{37}$$

where ϕ a complex field which is an $SU(2)_L$-doublet,

$$\phi = \begin{pmatrix} \varphi^+ \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(v_{SM} + H + i\xi) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{38}$$

They are related with each other via the Higgs mass

$$m_H^2 = 2\mu^2 = 2\lambda v_{SM}^2. \tag{39}$$

The VEV v_{SM} is constrained with the W mass m_W and $SU(2)_L$-gauge connection coefficient g (appearing in the Higgs-W coupling in the Higgs covariant derivative) and, thus, with the Fermi constant G_F,

$$v_{SM}^2 = \frac{4m_W^2}{g^2} = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2G_F} \approx (246 \text{ GeV})^2. \tag{40}$$

For $m_H = 125$ GeV and $v_{SM} = 246$ GeV, λ takes the value

$$\lambda = 0.129.$$

After assuming the scalar H_1 to be the 125 GeV Higgs boson, it is reasonable to assume the scalars H_2 and H_3 to be heavier than 125 GeV. Recently, ATLAS and CMS announced a 750 GeV diphoton excess [40, 41, 42], which could be a signal of a new boson (a confirmation still needed). The latter, if existing, is much, six times, heavier than the already discovered

Higgs boson. If we identify one of the rest two scalar mass states with this 750 GeV diphoton resonance we should have

$$m_{H_{2,3}} \approx 6 m_{H_1}, \tag{41}$$

or λ_2 compared to λ_1, λ_3 and λ_4^R, is very large. Thus, we have the relation between the masses m_{H_i}

$$\frac{1}{3}(m_{H_1}^2 + m_{H_2}^2 + m_{H_3}^2) \approx 2\pi v_{SM}^2. \tag{42}$$

This relation is a model-independent identity with a given numerical input but it may have a more analytical meaning. Here m_{H_2} and m_{H_3} take the same value 750 GeV, but in practice, as said earlier, they may be (slightly) differ from each other. However, this difference may represent a small correction to a mean value and (42) can be still considered as an (approximated) identity. This identity, together with (34), give

$$(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) v^2 \approx \pi v_{SM}^2. \tag{43}$$

Because of (41) we can assume $m_{H_1}^2 \ll m_{H_{2,3}}^2$, thus,

$$m_H^2 \equiv m_{H_1}^2 \approx \frac{1}{12} \times \pi v_{SM}^2, \tag{44}$$

$$m_{H_{2,3}}^2 \approx 3 \times \pi v_{SM}^2. \tag{45}$$

We note that πv_{SM}^2 can be treated as the area of a circle of radius $r = v_{SM}$ or an half of the circumference of a circle of radius $R = v_{SM}^2$. Another geometric interpretation of Eq. (34) (and Eq. (42), respectively) is it describes a 2-sphere S_2 of radius $\sqrt{6(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)}.v$ (and $\sqrt{6\pi}.v_{SM}$, respectively) in the three-dimensional mass space (m_1, m_2, m_3).

Using (36) and (43) we can determine two (combinations) of λ's if v is known, or vice versa. These relations of λ's and v are of "see-saw" type. Writing

$$v = a \times v_{SM}, \tag{46}$$

where a is an arbitrary real number, we have

$$\lambda_1 + \lambda_3 + \lambda_4^R = \frac{\lambda}{a^2} \approx \frac{\pi}{24 a^2}, \quad \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \approx \frac{\pi}{a^2}. \tag{47}$$

To determine the value of v we consider its relation to the gauge boson masses, say W mass. The latter in the present model has the form

$$m_W^2 = \frac{1}{4} g^2 (v_1^2 + v_2^2 + v_3^2) = \frac{3}{4} g^2 v^2. \tag{48}$$

This expression of the W mass should equal the SM one

$$m_W^2 = \frac{1}{4} g^2 v_{SM}^2, \tag{49}$$

or

$$v = \frac{v_{SM}}{\sqrt{3}} = \frac{246}{\sqrt{3}} \text{ GeV}, \tag{50}$$

that is $a = 1/\sqrt{3}$, and, thus,

$$\lambda_1 + \lambda_3 + \lambda_4^R \approx \frac{\pi}{8}, \quad \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \approx 9.4242 \approx 3\pi. \tag{51}$$

From here we have

$$\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = 24(\lambda_1 + \lambda_3 + \lambda_4^R), \tag{52}$$

that is

$$\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \gg \lambda_1 + \lambda_3 + \lambda_4^R.$$

Assuming all λ's have the same signs, e.g., all positive, or interactions between the scalars H_i are small compared to their self-interactions (i.e., $\lambda_3, \lambda_4 < \lambda_1, \lambda_2$) we get $\lambda_2 \gg \lambda_1$. From here we can estimate λ's as follows

$$\lambda_1, \lambda_3, \lambda_4^R \leq \frac{\pi}{8}, \quad \lambda_2 \geq \frac{23}{8}\pi \approx 3\pi. \tag{53}$$

4.2 Lepton sector

The lepton sector contains charged leptons and neutrinos. In the present model, the charged lepton masses can be generated by the Yukawa terms of the Lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathcal{L}_{Y_{cl}} &= y_1(\overline{\ell}_L\Phi_h)\ell_{R1} + y_2(\overline{\ell}_L\Phi_h)^{''}\ell_{R2} + y_3(\overline{\ell}_L\Phi_h)^{'}\ell_{R3} + h.c. \\ &= y_1(v_1\overline{\ell}_{L1} + v_2\overline{\ell}_{L2} + v_3\overline{\ell}_{L3})\ell_{R1} + y_2(v_1\overline{\ell}_{L1} + \omega v_2\overline{\ell}_{L2} + \omega^2 v_3\overline{\ell}_{L3})\ell_{R2} \\ &\quad + y_3(\overline{v_1\ell}_{L1} + \omega^2 v_2\overline{\ell}_{L2} + \omega v_3\overline{\ell}_{L3})\ell_{R3} + h.c. \end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

After an A_4 and gauge symmetry breaking, the charged leptons gain masses with the mass matrix

$$M_{lept} = \begin{pmatrix} y_1v_1 & y_2v_1 & y_3v_1 \\ y_1v_2 & \omega y_2v_2 & \omega^2 y_3v_2 \\ y_1v_3 & \omega^2 y_2v_3 & \omega y_3v_3 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{55}$$

Taking into account (22), we can, without loss of generality, assume [3] that $\langle\Phi_h\rangle^T = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(v, v, v)$. Then the charged lepton mass matrix takes the form

$$M_{lept} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}U_L \begin{pmatrix} m_e & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & m_\mu & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & m_\tau \end{pmatrix}, \tag{56}$$

where

$$m_e = y_1v, \quad m_\mu = y_2v, \quad m_\tau = y_3v, \tag{57}$$

are the charged lepton masses, and

$$U_L = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & \omega & \omega^2 \\ 1 & \omega^2 & \omega \end{pmatrix}. \tag{58}$$

[3] Another choice of the Higgs VEV satisfying (22) gives a similar result.

For the neutrinos, their masses can be generated by the Yukawa terms

$$-\mathcal{L}_{Y_\nu} = y^\nu_{Ta}\left(\bar{\ell}_L\widetilde{\Phi}_h\right)_{3_1}\cdot N_T + y^\nu_{Tb}\left(\bar{\ell}_L\widetilde{\Phi}_h\right)_{3_2}\cdot N_T + y^\nu_S\left(\bar{\ell}_L\widetilde{\Phi}_h\right)_1\cdot N_S \\ + y^\nu_{S'}\left(\bar{\ell}_L\widetilde{\Phi}_h\right)_{1''}\cdot N_{S'} + y^\nu_{S''}\left(\bar{\ell}_L\widetilde{\Phi}_h\right)_{1'}\cdot N_{S''} + \frac{1}{2}\overline{(N_R)^c}\cdot M_R\cdot N_R + h.c., \tag{59}$$

where

$$N_T = (N_{T1}, N_{T2}, N_{T3})^T, \quad N_R = (N_{T1}, N_{T2}, N_{T3}, N_S, N_{S'}, N_{S''})^T. \tag{60}$$

After A_4 discrete symmetry is broken, using the notation $n_L = (\nu_L, (N_R)^c)^T$, we write this neutrino mass terms in a compact form as

$$-\mathcal{L}_{Y_\nu} = \frac{1}{2}\overline{n}_L M_{\text{seesaw}}(n_L)^c + h.c, \tag{61}$$

where M_{seesaw} is 9×9 matrix

$$M_{\text{seesaw}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & M_D \\ M_D^T & M_R \end{pmatrix}. \tag{62}$$

Here, M_D is the Dirac mass matrix

$$M_D = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & y^\nu_{Ta}v_3 & y^\nu_{Tb}v_2 & y^\nu_S v_1 & y^\nu_{S'}v_1 & y^\nu_{S''}v_1 \\ y^\nu_{Tb}v_3 & 0 & y^\nu_{Ta}v_1 & y^\nu_S v_2 & y^\nu_{S'}v_2\omega^2 & y^\nu_{S''}v_2\omega \\ y^\nu_{Ta}v_2 & y^\nu_{Tb}v_1 & 0 & y^\nu_S v_3 & y^\nu_{S'}v_3\omega & y^\nu_{S''}v_3\omega^2 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{63}$$

In this model, we work in the basis of the mass-eigen states of the sterile neutrinos (right-handed neutrinos) and with the scale of M_R large enough compared to that of the light neutrinos [4], therefore, the mass matrix M_R can be roughly written in the form proportional to a 6×6 unit matrix I,

$$M_R = M.I, \tag{64}$$

where M is a large number, then, the light neutrino masses are generated in the scheme of the see-saw type I as follows

$$M_\nu = -M_D^T(M_R)^{-1}M_D = \begin{pmatrix} a & b & c \\ b & e & d \\ c & d & f \end{pmatrix}, \tag{65}$$

where

$$a = (M_\nu)_{11} = -M^{-1}\frac{v^2}{2}\left[(y^\nu_S)^2 + (y^\nu_{S'})^2 + (y^\nu_{S''})^2 + (y^\nu_{Ta})^2 + (y^\nu_{Tb})^2\right], \tag{66}$$

$$e = (M_\nu)_{22} = -M^{-1}\frac{v^2}{2}\left[(y^\nu_S)^2 + \omega(y^\nu_{S'})^2 + \omega^2(y^\nu_{S''})^2 + (y^\nu_{Ta})^2 + (y^\nu_{Tb})^2\right], \tag{67}$$

$$f = (M_\nu)_{33} = -M^{-1}\frac{v^2}{2}\left[(y^\nu_S)^2 + \omega^2(y^\nu_{S'})^2 + \omega(y^\nu_{S''})^2 + (y^\nu_{Ta})^2 + (y^\nu_{Tb})^2\right], \tag{68}$$

$$b = (M_\nu)_{12} = (M_\nu)_{21} = -M^{-1}\frac{v^2}{2}\left[y^\nu_{Ta}y^\nu_{Tb} + (y^\nu_S)^2 + \omega^2(y^\nu_{S'})^2 + \omega(y^\nu_{S''})^2\right], \tag{69}$$

$$c = (M_\nu)_{13} = (M_\nu)_{31} = -M^{-1}\frac{v^2}{2}\left[y^\nu_{Ta}y^\nu_{Tb} + (y^\nu_S)^2 + \omega(y^\nu_{S'})^2 + \omega^2(y^\nu_{S''})^2\right], \tag{70}$$

$$d = (M_\nu)_{23} = (M_\nu)_{32} = -M^{-1}\frac{v^2}{2}\left[y^\nu_{Ta}y^\nu_{Tb} + (y^\nu_S)^2 + (y^\nu_{S'})^2 + (y^\nu_{S''})^2\right]. \tag{71}$$

[4] It is an applicability condition of the see-saw mechanism.

Since we shall work in the basis, where charged lepton mass matrix is diagonal, the light neutrino mass matrix must be transformed to the following one,

$$\mathbb{M}_\nu = U_L^\dagger M_\nu U_L^* = \begin{pmatrix} A & B & C \\ B & E & D \\ C & D & F \end{pmatrix}, \tag{72}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \frac{1}{3}(a+2b+2c+2d+e+f), \quad B = \frac{1}{3}(a-\omega b-\omega^2 c-\omega d+\omega^2 e+\omega f), \\ C &= \frac{1}{3}(a-\omega^2 b-\omega c-\omega d+\omega e+\omega^2 f), \quad D = \frac{1}{3}(a-b-c-d+e+f), \\ E &= \frac{1}{3}(a+2\omega^2 b+2\omega c+2d+\omega e+\omega^2 f), \quad F = \frac{1}{3}(a+2\omega b+2\omega^2 c+2d+\omega^2 e+\omega f). \end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

Before finishing this section let us discuss the mass scales, M_R, M_D and M_ν, involved. The general ranges of these mass scales are given in Tab. 6. According to the current experimental data [14] the upper bound of the light neutrino masses (the scale of M_ν) is below 10^{-1} eV $= 10^{-10}$ GeV. Thus, if the scale of M_D is known, we can estimate the mass scale M_R in relation to the coupling coefficients in (59), and vice versa, knowing M_R we can determine M_D. While the scale M_ν is bounded today narrowly between 0 eV and 10^{-1} eV (even less), the scales of M_R and M_D still vary in wider ranges covering the electroweak (EW) scale 10^2 GeV as well as the LHC discovering potential at about 1 TeV $= 10^3$ GeV. On searching for heavy Majorana neutrinos within the type-I see-saw mechanism with the ATLAS detector in $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV pp collisions [48] the range of M_R has been set to be between 100 – 500 GeV, while the ranges given by CMS are 90 GeV $< M_R <$ 200 GeV (for ee final states in $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV pp collisions) [49] and 40 GeV $< M_R <$ 500 GeV (for $\mu\mu$ final states in $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV pp collisions) [50]. An M_R at the GUT scale and an M_D at the EW scale are often taken in a see-saw model (see, for example, [44] and references therein) but, in general, the range of M_R, as mentioned earlier, could spread from the eV scale to the GUT scale (see, for example, [47] and references therein) and M_D, at least here, is not constrained yet by any other constraint besides that related to Yukawa coupling coefficients in (59). A determination or estimation of the latter (via measurements of some processes such as those involved charged leptons) can shed a light on the scale of M_D and thus on that of M_R. At the present, we only know that these coefficients must be small, therefore, the scale M_D should not be large. The branching ratios of a charged lepton decay tells us that these Yukawa coupling coefficients could be at least four magnitudes (10^{-4}) below that of an EW one, hence M_D could be at the order 10^{-2} GeV at most, thus, M_R could be at the 10 TeV scale at most. Interestingly, the recent observation of 3.5 keV X-ray signals from several galaxies and galaxy clusters [51, 52] could be explained by a decay of keV sterile neutrinos. The latter, if in a see-saw model, lead to very small (unless the VEV of the related scalar field(s) is small or the scale M_ν is big enough) Dirac mass scale and coupling coefficients (see Tab. 6), the measurement of which is still very difficult.

Mass scale	$\mathbf{M_R}$ (GeV)	$\mathbf{M_\nu}$ (GeV)	$\mathbf{M_D = (M_\nu M_R)^{1/2}}$ (GeV)	$\mathbf{y_D = M_D v^{-1}}$
GUT	$\sim 10^{15}$	$< 10^{-10}$	$\sim 10^2 \div 10^3$	$\sim 10^0 \div 10^1$
TeV	$\sim 10^3$	$< 10^{-10}$	$\sim 10^{-4} \div 10^{-3}$	$\sim 10^{-6} \div 10^{-5}$
GeV	$\sim 10^0$	$< 10^{-10}$	$\sim 10^{-5}$	$\sim 10^{-7}$
MeV	$\sim 10^{-3}$	$< 10^{-10}$	$\sim 10^{-7} \div 10^{-6}$	$\sim 10^{-9} \div 10^{-8}$
keV	$\sim 10^{-6}$	$< 10^{-10}$	$\sim 10^{-8}$	$\sim 10^{-10}$
eV	$\sim 10^{-9}$	$< 10^{-10}$	$\sim 10^{-10} \div 10^{-9}$	$\sim 10^{-12} \div 10^{-11}$

Table 6: Mass scales of the model.

5 Neutrino masses and mixing

As said above (and also in [53]), the experimental PNMS mixing matrix is shown to be close to the TBM mixing matrix (see its explicit form below), therefore, the former can be presented as a perturbation around the latter. It follows from the fact that the difference, say ΔU, between the experimental PNMS mixing matrix [14] and the TBM one is just a small correction to the latter (upto a phase factor):

$$\Delta U = \begin{pmatrix} 0.006 & -0.029 & 0.153e^{-i\delta} \\ -0.008 - 0.084e^{i\delta} & 0.047 - 0.056e^{i\delta} & -0.054 \\ -0.041 - 0.095e^{i\delta} & 0.027 - 0.064e^{i\delta} & 0.034 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{74}$$

Therefore, the (actual) neutrino mass matrix diagonalisable by the (experimental) PMNS mixing matrix, can be developed pertubatively around the TBM one [53, 54]:

$$\mathbb{M}_\nu = M_0 + \mathcal{V}, \tag{75}$$

where M_0 is the unperturbative TBM part which can be diagonalized by the TBM mixing matrix

$$U_{TBM} = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} & \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} & 0 \\ -\sqrt{\frac{1}{6}} & \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} & \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \sqrt{\frac{1}{6}} & -\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} & \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{76}$$

while $\mathcal{V}$ is a small matrix, compared to $\mathbb{M}_\nu$ (or M_0). It is easy to see that M_0 and $\mathcal{V}$ have the form

$$M_0 = \begin{pmatrix} A & B & -B \\ B & E & -(A+B-E) \\ -B & -(A+B-E) & E \end{pmatrix}, \tag{77}$$

$$\mathcal{V} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & e_1 \\ 0 & 0 & e_3 \\ e_1 & e_3 & e_2 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{78}$$

with

$$e_1 = B + C, \quad e_2 = E - F, \quad e_3 = A + B + D - E. \tag{79}$$

The TBM mixing matrix can be expressed in terms of eigen-vectors $|n^0\rangle$, $n = 1, 2, 3$, of M_0 and also $M_0^\dagger M_0$ as follows

$$U_{TBM} = \left(|1^0\rangle, |2^0\rangle, |3^0\rangle\right). \tag{80}$$

The eigen-vectors $|n\rangle$ of the matrix $\mathbb{M}_\nu^\dagger \mathbb{M}_\nu$ perturbatively developed around $|n^0\rangle$ have the form (taken upto the first perturbation order)

$$|n\rangle = |n^0\rangle + \sum_{k\neq n} \lambda_{nk}|k^0\rangle + ..., \tag{81}$$

where

$$\lambda_{nk} = (|m_n^0|^2 - |m_k^0|^2)^{-1} V_{nk}, \quad V_{nk} = \langle n^0|M_0^\dagger \mathcal{V} + \mathcal{V}^\dagger M_0|k^0\rangle, \tag{82}$$

and $|m_i^0|^2$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, are eigenvalues of $M_0^\dagger M_0$.

Now we can diagonalize the neutrino mass matrix square $\mathbb{M}_\nu^\dagger \mathbb{M}_\nu$,

$$\tilde{U}^\dagger \mathbb{M}_\nu^\dagger \mathbb{M}_\nu \tilde{U} = \text{diag}\,(|m_1|^2, |m_2|^2, |m_3|^2), \tag{83}$$

by the matrix

$$\tilde{U} = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}x^* & \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} - \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}x & -\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}y - \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}z \\ -\sqrt{\frac{1}{6}} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}x^* + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}}y^* & \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{6}}x + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}}z^* & \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{6}}y - \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}z \\ \sqrt{\frac{1}{6}} - \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}x^* + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}}y^* & -\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} - \sqrt{\frac{1}{6}}x + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}}z^* & \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} - \sqrt{\frac{1}{6}}y + \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}z \end{pmatrix}, \tag{84}$$

with

$$x = \lambda_{12}, \;\; y = \lambda_{13}, \;\; z = \lambda_{23}. \tag{85}$$

Any matrix U', related to $\tilde{U}$ by the relation $U' = \tilde{U} \times P'$, where $P' = \text{diag}\left(e^{i\alpha'_1/2}, e^{i\alpha'_2/2}, e^{i\alpha'_3/2}\right)$, with arbitrary α'_1, α'_2, α'_3, is also able to diagonalize $\mathbb{M}_\nu^\dagger \mathbb{M}_\nu$. Therefore, a PMNS matrix U_{PMNS} can be defined upto a phase matrix P',

$$U_{PMNS} = \tilde{U} \times P', \tag{86}$$

Writing P' as $P' = e^{i\alpha'_3/2}\text{diag}\left(e^{i(\alpha'_1-\alpha'_3)/2}, e^{i(\alpha'_2-\alpha_3)/2}, 1\right) \equiv e^{i\alpha'_3/2}\text{diag}\left(e^{i\alpha'_{21}/2}, e^{i\alpha'_{31}/2}, 1\right)$, we see that the phase α'_3 can be removed by redefining the overall field phase as done in the case of P. Thus, one can write P' in a form similar to that of P in (2):

$$P' = \text{diag}\left(e^{i\alpha'_{21}/2}, e^{i\alpha'_{31}/2}, 1\right). \tag{87}$$

It is important to mention that x, y and z, in general, are complex numbers, so do the matrix elements of $\tilde{U}$, therefore, not only the mixing angles but also the Majorana phases can get a small correction from $\tilde{U}$. The latter, through complex x, y and z, has six degrees of freedom (DOF's). Four of them parametrize the three mixing angles and the CPV phase. The other two DOF's, namely, two phases, can be used to synchronize the phases of P' with those of P. Therefore, two of x, y and z (or two of their independent linear combinations) can be taken to be real. Comparing (3) with (84), we see that it is reasonable to choose a real x.

Using the trivial properties of the PMNS matrix given in (3), $\tan^2\theta_{12} = |U_{12}|^2/|U_{11}|^2$, $\sin\theta_{13} = |U_{13}|$, $\tan^2\theta_{23} = |U_{23}|^2/|U_{33}|^2$, applied to (84), we obtain at the first perturbation order the relations

$$\tan^2\theta_{12} \approx \frac{1-2\sqrt{2}\mathrm{Re}(x)}{2+2\sqrt{2}\mathrm{Re}(x)}, \tag{88}$$

$$\sin\theta_{13} = \left|\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}y + \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}z\right|, \tag{89}$$

$$\tan^2\theta_{23} \approx \frac{1+2\sqrt{2}\mathrm{Re}(\sqrt{\frac{1}{6}}y - \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}z)}{1-2\sqrt{2}\mathrm{Re}(\sqrt{\frac{1}{6}}y - \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}z)}. \tag{90}$$

Further, from Eqs. (1) and (86), it is easy to get

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\sqrt{\tfrac{2}{3}} + \sqrt{\tfrac{1}{3}}x^*\right) e^{i\alpha'_{21}/2} &= c_{12}c_{13}e^{i\alpha_{21}/2}, \\
\left(\sqrt{\tfrac{1}{3}} - \sqrt{\tfrac{2}{3}}x\right) e^{i\alpha'_{31}/2} &= s_{12}c_{13}e^{i\alpha_{31}/2}, \\
\left(-\sqrt{\tfrac{2}{3}}y - \sqrt{\tfrac{1}{3}}z\right) &= s_{13}e^{-i\delta}.
\end{aligned} \tag{91}$$

In general, as x is complex, $\alpha'_{21} \neq \alpha_{21}$ and $\alpha'_{31} \neq \alpha_{31}$, but in the case of a real x we have (at the first order of perturbation) $\alpha'_{21} = \alpha_{21}$ and $\alpha'_{31} = \alpha_{31}$.

Below, to check how our model works we will consider the case of a real parameter x, that is $P' = (e^{i\alpha_{21}/2}, e^{i\alpha_{31}/2}, 1) = P$, as argued above. Now, the PMNS matrix (86) gets the form

$$U_{PMNS} = \begin{pmatrix}
\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}x & \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} - \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}x & -\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}y - \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}z \\
-\sqrt{\frac{1}{6}} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}x + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}}y^* & \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{6}}x + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}}z^* & \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{6}}y - \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}z \\
\sqrt{\frac{1}{6}} - \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}x + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}}y^* & -\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} - \sqrt{\frac{1}{6}}x + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}}z^* & \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} - \sqrt{\frac{1}{6}}y + \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}z
\end{pmatrix} \times P. \tag{92}$$

Deriving x, y and z by matching the matrix elements $(U_{PMNS})_{11}$, $(U_{PMNS})_{13}$ and $(U_{PMNS})_{23}$ in Eq. (92) with the corresponding elements of the experimentally measured PMNS matrix at the current best fit value of neutrino oscillation data [14, 15], then, inserting them back in Eq. (92), we obtain the PMNS matrix given by the model

$$U^{model}_{PMNS} = \begin{pmatrix}
0.8221 & 0.5695 & 0.1530\, e^{-i\delta} \\
-0.4337 - 0.0883\, e^{i\delta} & 0.6252 - 0.0624\, e^{i\delta} & 0.6533 \\
0.3716 - 0.0883\, e^{i\delta} & -0.5373 - 0.0624\, e^{i\delta} & 0.7609
\end{pmatrix} \times P. \tag{93}$$

In the following, to check the present model we are going to analyze and discuss in the model scenario several physics quantities, which can be verified experimentally, such as the neutrinoless double beta decay effective mass $|\langle m_{ee}\rangle|$, CPV phase $\delta_{CP} \equiv \delta$ and Jarlskog parameter J_{CP}, using the PMNS matrix (84) matched with the current neutrino oscillation data [14, 15].

Neutrinoless double beta decay ($0\nu\beta\beta$) is a process of emitting two electrons from relevant nuclei without producing any (anti)neutrino, thus violating the lepton number by 2 units [55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62]. The ($0\nu\beta\beta$) decay together with the radiative emission of neutrino pair (RENP) from atom [63, 64, 65] are the only two, so far, proposed processes, used for construction of experiments for determination of the nature of neutrinos (if they are of Dirac- or Majorana type). With its importance in understanding neutrino properties, the phenomenon of the ($0\nu\beta\beta$) decay has attracted interest of and has been studied by a large number of physicists in both theoretical and experimental aspects. Presently, the most sensitive experiments give an upper bound on the ($0\nu\beta\beta$) decay effective mass to be about $|\langle m_{ee}\rangle| < 0.2 - 0.6$ eV (Heidelberg-Moscow [66]), or $0.3 - 0.71$ eV (COURICINO [67]), or $0.14 - 0.38$ eV (EXO-200 [68]), while the next generation of the experiments [69, 70] may obtain a signal of the decay if $|\langle m_{ee}\rangle|$ is not smaller than $(2-5)\times 10^{-2}$ eV. In the scenario of the present model, the ($0\nu\beta\beta$) decay effective mass has the form [5]

$$|\langle m_{ee}\rangle| = \left|m_1 U_{e1}^2 + m_2 U_{e2}^2 e^{i\alpha_{21}} + m_3 U_{e3}^2 e^{i\alpha_{31}}\right|. \tag{94}$$

The dependence of $|\langle m_{ee}\rangle|$ on the PMNS mixing matrix and the lightest active neutrino mass m_0 is depicted in Fig. 7.



Figure 7: The ($0\nu\beta\beta$) effective mass $|\langle m_{ee}\rangle|$ as a function of the lightest neutrino mass. *Left panel*: Plot obtained by using (92) with neutrino mixing angles taken arbitrary in 3σ ranges, while the phases δ, α_{21} and α_{31} varying in $[0, 2\pi]$. *Right panel*: Plot taken from [14].

To measure the Dirac CPV phase δ is a challenge but with the nonzero value of θ_{13} obtained by recent experiments, the measurement of δ becomes more realistic. The simplest

[5] We have taken into account the smallness of the mixing matrix elements U_{ek} for $k \geq 4$, and the function $F(M_k, A) = 0$ for large M_k, where A is an atom number of a nuclear (see [71] and its quotes).

and direct strategy, which has been arranged experimentally, is to determine the difference between the probabilities of a neutrino transition and an anti-neutrino transition [72, 73],

$$A_{CP}^{(\alpha,\beta)} = P(\nu_\alpha \to \nu_\beta) - P(\bar{\alpha}_\alpha \to \bar{\nu}_\beta) = -16 J_{\alpha\beta} \sin\Delta_{12} \sin\Delta_{23} \sin\Delta_{31}, \tag{95}$$

where $\Delta_{ij} \equiv \Delta m_{ij}^2 L/4E$, and $J_{\alpha\beta}$ is the Jarlskog invariant quantity [74],

$$J_{\alpha\beta} = J_{CP} = \mathrm{Im}\{U_{\alpha1}^* U_{\beta2}^* U_{\alpha1} U_{\beta2}\} = J_{CP}^{max} \sin\delta. \tag{96}$$

Using the canonical parametrization of the PMNS matrix expressed in Eq. (3), it is not difficult to obtain

$$J_{CP}^{max} = \cos\theta_{12} \sin\theta_{12} \cos\theta_{23} \sin\theta_{23} \cos^2\theta_{13} \sin\theta_{13}. \tag{97}$$

For the value of θ_{13} obtained by recent experiments, J_{CP}^{max} takes value in the interval $[0.032 - 0.042]$ with neutrino oscillation angles varying in 3σ allowed ranges (learn more in Fig. 8). We see that the most possible values of δ are located around $\pi/2$ (=90°) and $3\pi/2$ (=270°), where $|J_{CP}|$ would take a value, which in fact is the maximal value J_{CP}^{max}, between $0.032 - 0.042$.



Figure 8: J_{CP} as a function of θ_{13} (*left panel*) and δ_{CP} (*right panel*) with neutrino mixing angles taken in 3σ allowed ranges, and the CPV phase varying in $[0, 2\pi]$.

When x is real, it is easy to see from Eqs. (88)–(90), the value of the mixing angle θ_{12} depends only on x, while the other two mixing angles θ_{13} and θ_{23} as well as the Dirac CPV phase δ are determined by y and z via, for example, the equations

$$\sin\theta_{13} e^{-i\delta} = -\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} y - \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} z, \quad \tan^2\theta_{23} = \frac{1 + 2\sqrt{2}\mathrm{Re}(\sqrt{\frac{1}{6}} y - \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} z)}{1 - 2\sqrt{2}\mathrm{Re}(\sqrt{\frac{1}{6}} y - \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} z)}. \tag{98}$$

Since y and z are complex numbers, they contain four parameters. One of these parameters can be used to synchronize a Majorana phase (as mentioned above), two are used to fix

the mixing angles θ_{13} and θ_{23}, and the remaining one is used for the Dirac CPV phase δ. Therefore, δ can theoretically take any value in the range of $[0, 2\pi]$.

Let us consider some specific values of parameters x, y, for example $y = 0$ or $z = 0$. In case $y = 0$ and z arbitrary (or $z = 0$ and y arbitrary), we have only two free parameters to fix 3 measurements θ_{13}, θ_{23} and δ, thus δ can be expressed in term of θ_{13}, θ_{23}. For $y = 0$, we have

$$-\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}z = \sin\theta_{13}e^{-i\delta}, \quad \tan^2\theta_{23} = \frac{1 + 2\sqrt{2}\mathrm{Re}(-\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}z)}{1 - 2\sqrt{2}\mathrm{Re}(-\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}z}. \tag{99}$$

Eliminating z in Eqs. (99), we obtain the constraint

$$\sin\theta_{13}\cos\delta = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}\frac{\tan^2\theta_{23} - 1}{\tan^2\theta_{23} + 1}. \tag{100}$$

We can find δ from (100) for a given set of the mixing angles (see their experimental data in Tab. 1). If a value δ_0 is a solution of (100) so is $2\pi - \delta_0$, therefore it is enough to discuss one of them. This constraint gives, for example, at the best fit value (BFV) of the mixing angles θ_{13} and θ_{23} in an NO (and similarly for an IO) $\cos\delta = -0.291$, corresponding to the value $\delta \approx 4.414$ (and also $\delta \approx 1.866$). In general, this value of δ is not its mean value (BFV) but can give a rough estimation of the latter.

Based on the constraint (100), the distributions of δ for a normal ordering (NO) and an inverse ordering (IO), are depicted in Fig. 9, followed by Fig. 10, where δ as function of θ_{13} is plotted also for both cases. For each of these distributions generated by 10 000 events, the Dirac CPV phase δ, and, thus, the Jarlskog parameter J_{CP} (plotted in Figs. 11 and 12), is numerically calculated event by event with an input (s_{ij}) taken randomly on the base of a Gaussian distribution characterized by an experimental mean value (best fit value) and sigmas given in Tab. 1. These distributions δ have a mean values $\bar{\delta}_{NO} = 4.417 \approx 1.41\pi$ (for an NO) and $\bar{\delta}_{IO} = 4.616 \approx 1.47\pi$ (for an IO) which are close to the global fits at $\delta = \delta_{NO} \equiv 1.39\pi$ and at $\delta = \delta_{IO} \equiv 1.31\pi$, respectively [14, 15].



Figure 9: Distributions of δ_{CP} in an NO and an IO for two solutions distinguished by red and blue.



Figure 10: δ_{CP} as a function of θ_{13} in an NO and an IO, where the 1σ, 2σ and 3σ regions are colored in red, green and blue, respectively.

Using (96) and (97), the distributions of J_{CP} corresponding to those of δ in two cases of hierarchy are depicted in Figs. 11 and 12. Because of the symmetry of J_{CP} only its positive part is plotted in Fig. 11. The values of J_{CP} obtained around 0.032 (for an NO) and 0.034 (for an IO) are quite consistent with the ones given in [14].



Figure 11: Distribution of J_{CP} in an NO and an IO



Figure 12: J_{CP} as a function of θ_{13} in an NO and an IO.

To summarise, we note that the best fit values of δ and J_{CP} obtained here are very close (in general, at the 1σ region) to the global fit given in [14, 15].

6 Conclusions

Neutrino masses and mixing are an experimental fact. Neutrinos are massive but their masses are very tiny. Therefore, an actual problem is to find a way to explain the smallness of the neutrino masses and the see-saw mechanism is one of the most popular ways serving this purpose. So far many models of neutrino masses and mixing including those with the flavour symmetry have been proposed. In particular, the models based on the discrete group A_4 has attracted much interest and has been investigated quite intensively for the last several years. A natural question arising is whether and how the see-saw mechanism can be

extended to the case of a flavour symmetric SM. Certainly, some separate see-saw models have been applied to this case but, to our knowledge, no general and systematic formulation of the see-saw mechanism has been made for an A_4-flavour symmetric SM yet. In the present paper such a formulation with an accent on a type-I see-saw model has been made.

The scalar sector of the latter model consists of an A_4 triplet of scalar iso-doublets which are superpositions of three mass states, among two of which there is a mass degeneration which could be eliminated by some interactions, i.e., by further breaking (newly imposed or present) symmetry. For an interpretation, the non-degenerated state is identified by us with the newly discovered 125 GeV Higgs boson, while one or both of the other two (degenerated ones) could be tentatively identified with the still-deliberated 750 GeV diphoton resonance at 13 TeV LHC collisions. Thus, several interesting relations between the scalar masses and coupling coefficients are derived. These relations allow us to get some estimation of the coupling coefficients.

The lepton sector of the above-mentioned model consists of the SM-like leptons transforming now under also the group A_4 as its three- or one-dimensional representations, and four new iso-singlet fields transforming as an A_4-triplet and three A_4-singlets 1, $1'$ and $1''$. These newly introduced iso-singlet fields, referred to as right-handed neutrinos, are necessary for the neutrino mass generation via the type-I see-saw mechanism. Applying a perturbation method to this model we obtain a neutrino mass and mixing structure from where several important quantities, such as neutrinoless double beta decay effective mass $|\langle m_{ee}\rangle|$, CP violation phase δ_{CP} and Jarlskog parameter J_{CP} are predicted. The predicted values of these quantities within the present model fit quite well to the current experimental data.

For conclusion, it is shown once again in this paper the usefulness of the see-saw mechanism applied to A_4 flavour symmetric standard models predicting new particles, interesting relations and values of some physics quantities which can be tested experimentally.

Acknowledgments

This work is supported by Vietnam's National Foundation for Science and Technology Development (NAFOSTED).

Three of us (D.N.D, N.A.K. and N.T.H.V.) would like to thank Kumar Narain for warm hospitality in the Abdus Salam ICTP, Trieste, Italy. N.A.K. would like to thank Wolfgang Lerche and Luis Alvarez-Gaume for warm hospitality at CERN, Geneva, Switzerland.

References

[1] D. J. Griffiths, *"Introduction to elementary particles"*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1987.

[2] T. P. Cheng and L.F. Li, *"Gauge theory of elementary particle physics"*, Oxford university press, Oxford, 2006.

[3] M. E. Peskin and D. V. Schroeder, *"An introduction to quantum field theory"*, Addison-Wesley publishing company, Reading, Massachusetts, 1995.

[4] Ho Kim Quang and Pham Xuan Yem, *"Elementary particles and their interactions: concepts and phenomena"*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998.

[5] G. Aad *et al.* (ATLAS collaboration), *"Observation of a new particle in the search for the standard model Higgs boson with the ATLAS detector at the LHC"*, Phys. Lett. B**716** (2012) 1 [arXiv:1207.7214 [hep-ex]].

[6] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* (CMS collaboration), *"Observation of a new boson at a mass of 125 GeV with the CMS experiment at the LHC"*, Phys. Lett. B**716** (2012) 30 [arXiv:1207.7235 [hep-ex]].

[7] Nguyen Anh Ky and Nguyen Thi Hong Van, *"Was the Higgs boson discovered?"*, Commun. Phys. **25** (2015) 1 [arXiv:1503.08630 [hep-ph]].

[8] Y. Fukuda *et al.* [Super-Kamiokande Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **433**, (1998), 9 [hep-ex/9803006].

[9] Y. Fukuda *et al.* [Super-Kamiokande collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **436**, (1998) 33 [hep-ex/9805006].

[10] Y. Fukuda *et al.* [Super-Kamiokande collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, (1998) 1562 [hep-ex/9807003].

[11] Q. R. Ahmad *et al.* [SNO Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, (2001) 071301 [nucl-ex/0106015].

[12] Q. R. Ahmad *et al.* [SNO Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, (2002) 011301 [nucl-ex/0204008].

[13] Q. R. Ahmad *et al.* [SNO Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, (2002) 011302 [nucl-ex/0204009].

[14] K. Nakamura and S. T. Petcov in K. A. Olive *et al.* [Particle Data Group collaboration], *"Review of Particle Physics"*, Chin. Phys. C **38**, (2014) 090001.

[15] F. Capozzi, G. L. Fogli, E. Lisi, A. Marrone, D. Montanino and A. Palazzo, Phys. Rev. D **89**, (2014) 093018 [arXiv:1312.2878 [hep-ph]].

[16] P. F. Harrison, D. H. Perkins and W. G. Scott, Phys. Lett. B **530**, (2002) 167 [hep-ph/0202074].

[17] P. Minkowski, Phys. Lett. B **67**, (1977) 412.

[18] M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond and R. Slansky, "*Complex spinors and unified theories*" in "*Supergravity*" (Workshop proceedings, Stony Brook, 27-29 September 1979, eds. P. Van Nieuwenhuizen and D. Z. Freedman), North-Holland, Amsterdam (1979), p. 341 [arXiv:1306.4669 [hep-th]].

[19] R. N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanovic, Phys. Rev. Lett. **44**, (1980) 912.

[20] J. Schechter and J. W. F. Valle, Phys. Rev. D **22** (1980) 2227.

[21] J. Schechter and J. W. F. Valle, Phys. Rev. D **25** (1982) 774.

[22] S. Bilenky, *"Introduction to the physics of massive and mixed neutrinos"*, Springer, Berlin, 2010.

[23] R. N. Mohapatra and P. B. Pal, *"Massive neutrinos in physics and astrophysics"*, World Sci. Lect. Notes Phys. **60**, (1998) 1 [World Sci. Lect. Notes Phys. **72**, (2004)] 1.

[24] S. F. King, A. Merle, S. Morisi, Y. Shimizu and M. Tanimoto, New J. Phys. **16**, (2014) 045018 [arXiv:1402.4271 [hep-ph]].

[25] H. Ishimori, T. Kobayashi, H. Ohki, Y. Shimizu, H. Okada and M. Tanimoto, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **183** (2010) 1 [arXiv:1003.3552 [hep-th]].

[26] G. Altarelli and F. Feruglio, Rev. Mod. Phys. **82**, (2010) 2701 [arXiv:1002.0211 [hep-ph]].

[27] E. Ma, Phys. Rev. D **70** (2004) 031901 [hep-ph/0404199].

[28] G. Altarelli and D. Meloni, J. Phys. G **36** (2009) 085005 [arXiv:0905.0620 [hep-ph]].

[29] K. M. Parattu and A. Wingerter, Phys. Rev. D **84** (2011) 013011 [arXiv:1012.2842 [hep-ph]].

[30] S. F. King and C. Luhn, JHEP **1203** (2012) 036 [arXiv:1112.1959 [hep-ph]].

[31] G. Altarelli, F. Feruglio, L. Merlo and E. Stamou, JHEP **1208** (2012) 021 [arXiv:1205.4670 [hep-ph]].

[32] G. Altarelli, F. Feruglio and L. Merlo, Fortsch. Phys. **61** (2013) 507 [arXiv:1205.5133 [hep-ph]].

[33] P. M. Ferreira, L. Lavoura and P. O. Ludl, Phys. Lett. B **726** (2013) 767 [arXiv:1306.1500 [hep-ph]].

[34] J. Barry and W. Rodejohann, Phys. Rev. D **81** (2010) 093002 [Phys. Rev. D **81** (2010) 119901] [arXiv:1003.2385 [hep-ph]].

[35] Y. H. Ahn and S. K. Kang, Phys. Rev. D **86** (2012) 093003 [arXiv:1203.4185 [hep-ph]].

[36] R. Gonzalez Felipe, H. Serodio and J. P. Silva, Phys. Rev. D **88** (2013) 015015 [arXiv:1304.3468 [hep-ph]].

[37] A. E. Carcamo Hernandez, I. de Medeiros Varzielas, S. G. Kovalenko, H. Ps and I. Schmidt, Phys. Rev. D **88**, no. 7, 076014 (2013) [arXiv:1307.6499 [hep-ph]].

[38] I. de Medeiros Varzielas, O. Fischer and V. Maurer, JHEP **1508** (2015) 080 [arXiv:1504.03955 [hep-ph]].

[39] P. Q. Hung and T. Le, JHEP **1509** (2015) 001 [JHEP **1509** (2015) 134] [arXiv:1501.02538 [hep-ph]].

[40] The ATLAS collaboration, "*Search for resonances decaying to photon pairs in 3.2 fb^{-1} of pp collisions at $\sqrt{s}$ = 13 TeV with the ATLAS detector*," ATLAS-CONF-2015-081.

[41] The CMS Collaboration, *"Search for new physics in high mass diphoton events in proton-proton collisions at 13 TeV*," CMS-PAS-EXO-15-004.

[42] LHC seminar "*ATLAS and CMS physics results from Run 2*", given at CERN on 15 December 2015 by Marumi Kado [ATLAS] and Jim Olsen [CMS], https://indico.cern.ch/event/442432/.

[43] M. Drewes, Int. J. Mod. Phys. E **22**, (2013) 1330019 [arXiv:1303.6912 [hep-ph]].

[44] Dinh Nguyen Dinh, Nguyen Anh Ky, Nguyen Thi Hong Van and Phi Quang Van, Phys. Rev. D **74**, (2006) 077701.

[45] Nguyen Anh Ky and Nguyen Thi Hong Van, Phys. Rev. D **72**, (2005) 115017 [hep-ph/0512096].

[46] A. Merle, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **22**, (2013) 1330020 [arXiv:1302.2625 [hep-ph]].

[47] R. Adhikari, M. Agostini, Nguyen Anh Ky *et al*, "*A white paper on keV sterile neutrino dark matter*", arXiv:1602.04816 [hep-ph].

[48] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], JHEP **1507** (2015) 162 [arXiv:1506.06020 [hep-ex]].

[49] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **717** (2012) 109 [arXiv:1207.6079 [hep-ex]].

[50] V. Khachatryan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **748** (2015) 144 [arXiv:1501.05566 [hep-ex]].

[51] E. Bulbul, M. Markevitch, A. Foster, R. K. Smith, M. Loewenstein and S. W. Randall, Astrophys. J. **789** (2014) 13 [arXiv:1402.2301 [astro-ph.CO]].

[52] A. Boyarsky, O. Ruchayskiy, D. Iakubovskyi and J. Franse, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113** (2014) 251301 [arXiv:1402.4119 [astro-ph.CO]].

[53] Dinh Nguyen Dinh, Nguyen Anh Ky, Phi Quang Văn and Nguyen Thi Hồng Vân, *"A prediction of δ_{CP} for a normal neutrino mass hierarchy in an extended standard model with an A4 flavour symmetry"* (in Proceedings of the *2nd International workshop on theoretical and computational physics* (IWTCP-2), Buon-Ma-Thuot, 28-31 July 2014), J. Phys. Conf. Ser. **627**, no. 1 (2015) 012003.

[54] B. Brahmachari and P. Roy, JHEP **1502** (2015) 135 [arXiv:1407.5293 [hep-ph]].

[55] S. R. Elliott and J. Engel, J. Phys. G **30** (2004) R183 [hep-ph/0405078].

[56] F. T. Avignone, III, S. R. Elliott and J. Engel, Rev. Mod. Phys. **80** (2008) 481 [arXiv:0708.1033 [nucl-ex]].

[57] W. Rodejohann, Int. J. Mod. Phys. E **20** (2011) 1833 [arXiv:1106.1334 [hep-ph]].

[58] S. R. Elliott and P. Vogel, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **52** (2002) 115 [hep-ph/0202264].

[59] S. M. Bilenky, C. Giunti, J. A. Grifols and E. Masso, Phys. Rept. **379** (2003) 69 [hep-ph/0211462].

[60] S. M. Bilenky and C. Giunti, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **27** (2012) 1230015 [arXiv:1203.5250 [hep-ph]].

[61] J. J. Gomez-Cadenas, J. Martin-Albo, M. Mezzetto, F. Monrabal and M. Sorel, Riv. Nuovo Cim. **35** (2012) 29 [arXiv:1109.5515 [hep-ex]].

[62] B. Schwingenheuer, J. Phys. Conf. Ser. **375** (2012) 042007 [arXiv:1201.4916 [hep-ex]].

[63] M. Yoshimura, Phys. Lett. B **699** (2011) 123 [arXiv:1101.2749 [hep-ph]].

[64] D. N. Dinh, S. T. Petcov, N. Sasao, M. Tanaka and M. Yoshimura, Phys. Lett. B **719** (2013) 154 [arXiv:1209.4808 [hep-ph]].

[65] A. Fukumi, S. Kuma, Y. Miyamoto, K. Nakajima, I. Nakano, H. Nanjo, C. Ohae and N. Sasao *et al.*, PTEP **2012** (2012) 04D002 [arXiv:1211.4904 [hep-ph]].

[66] H. V. Klapdor-Kleingrothaus *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. A **12** (2001) 147 [hep-ph/0103062].

[67] E. Andreotti *et al.*, Astropart. Phys. **34** (2011) 822 [arXiv:1012.3266 [nucl-ex]].

[68] M. Auger *et al.* [EXO-200 Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **109** (2012) 032505 [arXiv:1205.5608 [hep-ex]].

[69] F. Bellini *et al.*, Astropart. Phys. **33** (2010) 169 [arXiv:0912.0452 [physics.ins-det]].

[70] R. Gornea [EXO-200 Collaboration], J. Phys. Conf. Ser. **309** (2011) 012003.

[71] S. M. Bilenky and S. T. Petcov, Rev. Mod. Phys. **59** (1987) 671 [Rev. Mod. Phys. **61** (1989) 169] [Rev. Mod. Phys. **60** (1988) 575].

[72] V. D. Barger, K. Whisnant and R. J. N. Phillips, Phys. Rev. Lett. **45** (1980) 2084.

[73] S. Pakvasa, AIP Conf. Proc. **68** (1980) 1164.

[74] C. Jarlskog, Phys. Rev. Lett. **55** (1985) 1039.